



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/476,776 12/30/99 SHIOMI

T SON-1688

WM01/1026

RONALD P KANANEN ESQ
RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER
THE LION BUILDING
1233 20TH STREET NW SUITE 501
WASHINGTON DC 20036

EXAMINER

CHU, K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2651

DATE MAILED:

10/26/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

NOTIFICATION OF NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF 37 CFR 1.192(c)

1. The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the invention defined in the claims involved in the appeal, which refers to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters as required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(5).

(a) In the brief filed on August 14, 2001, under the section "Summary of Invention", Applicant does not explain his invention defined in the claims with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing.

2. The brief does not contain an argument which specifies the errors in the rejection and the specific limitations in the rejected claims, if appropriate, or other reasons, which cause the rejection to be in error.

(a) in the brief, referring to the argument to item 4 of the Advisory Action, Applicant does not response to the statement "new reference combines with the original reference is to reject the claim 1 again based on Applicant's remark which emphasis that a tilt sensing means is not required".

(b) in the brief, referring to the argument to item 5 of the Advisory Action, Applicant states that the response to the rejection on the independent claim 13 is on "February 15, 2001 response, p. 2 and Appellant's June 2, 2001 response, pp3 and 5-6". Accordingly, independent claim 13 is a method claim for adjusting a tilt angle of a tilt mechanism having steps of rotating a drive unit in a first direction and a second direction opposite to the first direction. Appellant's responses as indicated in above pages does not argue how claim 13 over come the prior art with respect to the method of rotating

the drive in two directions in order to achieve a neutral position during a tilt adjustment.

(c) in the brief, referring to the argument to item 3 (first occurrence) of the Advisory Action, Appellant does not response to the statement "In claim 1, the amended feature "without a tilt sensor input" does not imply that a tilt sensing device is not needed. According to Applicant's written description, for example, the tilting motor 56 in Fig. 15 is driven by a jitter measuring circuit 91 and a light detecting means to detect return time of the emitted laser beam."

3. The brief does not contain, for each rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103, an argument which specifies the errors in the rejection and, if appropriate, the specific limitations in the rejected claims which are not described in the prior art relied upon in the rejection, and an explanation how such limitations render the claimed subject matter unobvious over the prior art. If the rejection is based upon a combination of references, the argument must explain why the references, taken as a whole do not suggest the claimed subject matter, and shall include, as may be appropriate, an explanation of why features disclosed in one reference may not be properly combined with features disclosed in another reference. A general argument that all the limitations are not described in a single reference does not satisfy the requirements of 37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)(iv).

(a) In Claims 1-20, Appellant does not explain why the references, taken as a whole do not suggest the claimed subject matter, and shall include, as may be appropriate, an explanation of why features disclosed in one reference may not be properly combined with features disclosed in another reference.

Appellant is required to comply with provisions of 37 CFR
1.192(c).

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, Appellant must comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c) within the longest of any of the following TIME PERIODS: (1) ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS, whichever is longer, from the mailing of this communication; (2) within the time period for reply to the action from which appeal has been taken; or (3) within two months from the date of the notice of appeal under 37 CFR 1.191. Extensions of these time periods may be granted under 37 CFR 1.136.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231 Or
faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for formal communications intended for entry.
Or:

(703) 746-6909, (for informal or draft communications, please
label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II,
2021 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).


Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this
application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose
telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier
communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim CHU whose
telephone number is (703) 305-3032 between 9:30 am to 6:00 pm, Monday
to Friday.

KE 10/16/01

Kim-Kwok CHU
Examiner AU2651
October 16, 2001

(703) 305-3032


DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600